



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/369,804	08/06/1999	DAVID TIMPERLEY	2745/FBR	7273

7590 12/31/2002

Shahan Islam
KMZ Roseman
575 Madison Avenue
New York, NY 10022-2585

EXAMINER

MENDIRATTA, VISHU K

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3711

DATE MAILED: 12/31/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/369,804

Applicant(s)

TIMPERLEY, DAVID

Examiner

Vishu K Mendiratta

Art Unit

3711

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 April 1939.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-49 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-49 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-12 and 16-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Inoue (5395111).

Inoue teaches a gaming console (Fig.1) having symbols, 1st images and 2nd images (Fig.20, one symbol seen through the other symbol (see abstract) for winning combination. The second set of symbols are fixed, static, have graphics in windows. All limitations are inherent within reference. Applicant's claims 6,8,11,23,25,28 are broadly limited to "indicate" messages which would have been obvious in view of the second images of Inoue. One of ordinary skill in art at the time the invention was made would have indicated messages through second images.

3. Claims 13,29 and 32-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Inoue in view of Bennett.

Inoue teaches all limitations of these claims except that it does not teach a second image being triggered by occurrence of a combination. Bennett teaches a similar game where an animated second image is triggered by the occurrence of a special combination (abstract). In order to make the game interesting, it

Art Unit: 3711

would have been obvious to apply such commonly known practices as demonstrated by Bennett. One of ordinary skill in art at the time the invention was made would have utilized a triggering of a second image on occurrence of a special combination. Applicant's claims 6,8,11,23,25,28 are broadly limited to "indicate" messages which would have been obvious in view of the second images of Inoue. One of ordinary skill in art at the time the invention was made would have indicated messages through second images.

4. Claims 14,15,30,31,48 and 49 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Inoue in view of Okada.

Inoue teaches all limitations of these claims except that it does not teach video simulation, card symbols for playing poker. Okada teaches video simulation for displaying cards game for all types of combinations of cards (col.5, lines 55-65). In order to electronically display cards, it would have been obvious to use a video simulation which is applicable to displaying combination of cards for electronic display.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed 9/04/02 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. An intended use of an article does not add limitation to an article in the claim. Applicant is claiming an article and limitations such as naming displays as "basic" and "non-basic" pertain to rules of playing. Accordingly underlined limitations in amended claims do not carry any weight.

Art Unit: 3711

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Egging (4,306,768) and Takemoto (6,004,208) teach similar limitations.

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Vishu K Mendiratta whose telephone number is (703) 306-5695. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 8AM to 5PM.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Paul Sewell can be reached on (703) 308-2126. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9302 for regular communications and (703) 872-9303 for After Final communications.

Art Unit: 3711

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1148.

Vishu K Mendiratta
Examiner
Art Unit 3711

VKM
December 18, 2002

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Benjamin H. Layno", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Benjamin H. Layno
Primary Examiner